

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-19 are now pending, claims 1 and 7 being independent claims. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-12 have been amended. Claims 13-19 have been added.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by *Rozman et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,594,322). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 is directed to a starter/generator system for an engine. The system of claim 1 comprises: a starter/generator including an exciter stator with a DC winding; and a multi-use controller, for providing AC power to the exciter stator during a start mode of operation and DC power to the exciter stator during a generate mode, such that the multi-use controller operates as an exciter power supply during the start mode and as a generator control unit during the generate mode of operation.

Therefore, as clarified by the amendments presented in this Reply, the starter/generator system of claim 1 utilizes a multi-use controller that operates as an exciter power supply during a start mode of operation and as a generator control unit during a generate mode of operation.

Rozman discloses a brushless, synchronous generator system 10 that includes: a generator 12; a voltage regulator 40; and a power conversion system 54. Fig. 1; col. 5, lines 37-66. During a generating mode of operation, the voltage regulator 40 provides DC power to a field winding 28 disposed in a stator 26 of the generator 10. In a start mode of operation, an exciter power converter 76 of the power conversion system 54 provides AC power to the exciter field winding 28. Therefore, the starter/generator system of *Rozman* clearly utilizes separate generator control (voltage regulator 40) and exciter power supply (exciter power converter 76).

According to MPEP § 2131, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art

reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claims.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

At least in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that *Rozman* fails to anticipate claim 1, or any claim depending therefrom. Applicant further submits that independent claim 7, directed to a multi-use controller for a starter/generator system, defines over *Rozman* based on similar reasoning to that set forth above. Therefore, *Rozman* fails to anticipate claim 7, or any claim depending therefrom.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Conclusion

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number of (703) 205-8000. Facsimile communications may be sent to facsimile number (703) 205-8050.

Application No.: 10/649,548

Docket No.: H0004290/2929-0213P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

D. Richard Anderson

Registration No.: 40,439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants